



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/623,746	07/21/2003	Eric L. Andersen	100202636-1	7520
22879 7590 06/17/2008 HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400				
EXAMINER DULANEY, BENJAMIN O				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2625				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/17/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM
mkraft@hp.com
ipa.mail@hp.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/623,746

Applicant(s)

ANDERSEN ET AL.

Examiner

BENJAMIN O. DULANEY

Art Unit

2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/21/03
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

- 1) Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 9-12, 14, 15, 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. patent 7,149,979 by Beaven et al.
- 2) Regarding claims 1 and 9, Beaven teaches a method of imaging transparency sheet media, comprising: detecting a transparency media designation associated with an electronic document file (column 4, lines 55-56); determining a mirror imaging status in response to detecting the transparency media designation (column 4, line 57); deriving an electronic mirror image corresponding to the electronic document file in accordance with the status (column 4, lines 59-60; if a mirror image document is an option and printed it is inherent that it is at some point "derived"); and forming an image on a sheet of transparency sheet media in accordance with the electronic mirror image (column 4, lines 35-39).
- 3) Regarding claims 2 and 15, Beaven teaches the method of claim 1, and further comprising receiving the electronic document file from a user computer (figure 1; column 4, lines 19-24).

- 4) Regarding claims 4, 12 and 17, Beaven teaches the method of claim 1, and wherein determining the mirror imaging status includes detecting an automatic mirror imaging designation associated with the electronic document file (column 4, lines 56-57; when a transparency media is chosen the mirror image status is automatically set).
- 5) Regarding claim 5, 11 and 18, Beaven teaches the method of claim 1, and wherein determining a mirror imaging status includes receiving a user input designating one of a normal imaging or a mirror imaging (column 4, line 65 – column 5, line 1; when the conflict is detected user input then determines whether the imaging status should be normal or mirrored).
- 6) Regarding claims 10 and 19, Beaven teaches the computer-accessible storage media of claim 9, and wherein the computer-accessible storage media includes one of a compact disk, a magnetic disk, or a solid state memory (column 5, lines 57-67).
- 7) Regarding claim 14, Beaven teaches an imaging apparatus, comprising: an imaging engine configured to form images on a sheet media; and a controller coupled in controlling relationship with the imaging engine, the controller including a processor and a computer-accessible storage media, the computer-accessible storage media including an executable program code (column 4, lines 3-7; figure 1; driver operation can be in the printer), the program code configured to cause the processor to: detect a transparency media designation associated with an electronic document file (column 4, lines 55-56); determine a mirror imaging status in response to detecting the transparency media designation (column 4, line 57); derive an electronic mirror image of the electronic document file in accordance with the status (column 4, lines 59-60; if a

mirror image document is an option and printed it is inherent that it is at some point "derived"); and control the imaging engine to form an image on a transparency sheet media in accordance with the electronic mirror image (column 4, lines 35-39).

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7) Claims 6-8 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. patent 4,891,517 by Ushiro et al.

8) Regarding claim 6, Ushiro teaches a method of projecting an image, comprising: providing a sheet of transparency sheet media defined by a first side (column 4, lines 48-51); providing a projector having a platen (column 6, lines 34-35); forming a mirror image on the first side of the transparency sheet media (column 4, lines 48-51); placing the first side of the transparency sheet media in contact with the platen (column 6, lines 34-47); and projecting the image (column 6, lines 36-39).

9) Regarding claim 7, Ushiro teaches the method of claim 6, and wherein forming the mirror image includes forming the mirror image on the first side of the transparency sheet media in correspondence to an electronic document file (column 6, lines 9-12).

10) Regarding claim 8, Ushiro teaches the method of claim 6, and wherein projecting the image includes projecting the image in proper viewing orientation onto a screen (column 4, lines 35-42).

11) Regarding claim 26, Ushiro teaches an image projecting system, comprising: means for generating an electronic document file (column 6, lines 9-12); means for

Art Unit: 2625

deriving an electronic mirror image corresponding to the electronic document file; means for forming mirror images on a side of a transparency sheet media in accordance with the electronic mirror image (column 4, lines 48-51); and projecting means for supporting the imaged side of the transparency sheet media in contact with the projecting means and viewably projecting the mirror images in proper viewing orientation onto a surface (column 6, lines 34-47).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12) Claims 3, 16 and 20-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 7,149,979 by Beaven et al., and further in view of U.S. patent 4,891,517 by Ushiro et al.

13) Regarding claims 3 and 16, Beaven does not specifically teach the method of claim 1, and further comprising receiving the electronic document file from an optical scanner.

Ushiro teaches the method of claim 1, and further comprising receiving the electronic document file from an optical scanner (column 4, lines 44-47).

Beaven and Ushiro are combinable because they are both in the transparency recording field of endeavor.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Beaven and Ushiro to add receiving a document from a scanner. The motivation for doing so would have been to obtain data from an original (column 4, lines 44-47). Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Beaven and Ushiro to obtain the invention as specified by claims 3 and 16.

14) Regarding claim 20, Beaven does not specifically teach the apparatus of claim 14, and wherein the imaging engine is defined by one of a laser imaging engine, an inkjet imaging engine, or a thermal imaging engine.

Ushiro teaches the apparatus of claim 14, and wherein the imaging engine is defined by one of a laser imaging engine, an inkjet imaging engine, or a thermal imaging engine (column 5, line 3).

Beaven and Ushiro are combinable because they are both in the transparency recording field of endeavor.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Beaven and Ushiro to add a thermal print engine. The motivation for doing so would have been for "recording the image signals (column 4, line 48). Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Beaven and Ushiro to obtain the invention as specified by claim 20.

15) Regarding claim 21, Beaven teaches a system, comprising: a user computer configured to generate an electronic document file; an imaging apparatus coupled to the user computer and configured to form mirror images on a side of a transparency sheet

media in correspondence to the electronic document file, thus defining a mirror-imaged media (column 4, lines 55-60).

Beaven does not specifically teach an overhead projector configured to support the mirror-imaged media with the imaged side in contact with the overhead projector, the overhead projector further configured to viewably project the mirror images in proper viewing orientation onto a surface.

Ushiro teaches an overhead projector configured to support the mirror-imaged media with the imaged side in contact with the overhead projector, the overhead projector further configured to viewably project the mirror images in proper viewing orientation onto a surface (column 6, lines 34-47).

Beaven and Ushiro are combinable because they are both in the transparency recording field of endeavor.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Beaven and Ushiro to add an overhead projector. The motivation for doing so would have been to project images from a transparency (column 6, lines 34-47). Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Beaven and Ushiro to obtain the invention as specified by claim 21.

16) Regarding claim 22, Beaven teaches the system of claim 21, and wherein: the user computer is further configured to selectively derive an electronic mirror image corresponding to the electronic document file in response to a designation; and the imaging apparatus is further configured to form the mirror images on the transparency

sheet media using the electronic mirror image (column 4, lines 3-7 and 55-60; driver can be in the PC).

17) Regarding claim 23, Beaven teaches the system of claim 22, and wherein the user computer includes a driver configured to cause the user computer to selectively derive the electronic mirror image corresponding to the electronic document file in response to the designation (column 4, lines 55-67).

18) Regarding claim 24, Beaven teaches the system of claim 21, and wherein the imaging apparatus is further configured to: derive an electronic mirror image corresponding to the electronic document file in response to a designation; and form the mirror images on the transparency sheet media using the electronic mirror image (column 4, lines 3-7 and 55-60; driver can be in the printer).

19) Regarding claim 25, Beaven teaches the system of claim 24, and wherein the imaging apparatus includes a program code configured to cause the imaging apparatus to derive the electronic mirror image corresponding to the electronic document file in response to the designation (column 4, lines 55-67).

20) Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 7,149,979 by Beaven et al., and further in view of U.S. patent 7,315,389 by Kuwata et al.

Beaven does not specifically teach the computer-accessible storage media of claim 9, and wherein the program code is further configured such that deriving the

Art Unit: 2625

electronic mirror image includes transposing imaging information within the electronic document file about a predetermined line of symmetry.

Kuwata teaches the computer-accessible storage media of claim 9, and wherein the program code is further configured such that deriving the electronic mirror image includes transposing imaging information within the electronic document file about a predetermined line of symmetry (column 10, lines 61-64; column 22, lines 36-45; mirroring is by definition transposing across a line of symmetry).

Beaven and Kuwata are combinable because they are both in the image recording field of endeavor.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Beaven and Kuwata to add mirroring in a file. The motivation for doing so would have been to obtain a mirrored image file (column 10, lines 61-64). Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Beaven and Kuwata to obtain the invention as specified by claim 13.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BENJAMIN O. DULANEY whose telephone number is (571)272-2874. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (10am - 6pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Moore can be reached on (571)272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Benjamin O Dulaney/

Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/David K Moore/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625